Race to the Top Phase 3 Application Overview

November 16, 2011

Goals for the Session

- Provide applicants with an overview of the notice and the application
  - The information we have released – what and where to find it
  - How the budget will work
  - The application submission and review process

- Answer any questions that we can

Reminders

- This is <u>not</u> a competition, so ask your questions as we go

- Additional questions may be submitted to racetothetop@ed.gov

- All relevant notices, FAQs and application materials can be found at Website: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase3-resources.html.

Introductions

Agenda

- Overview of Race to the Top Phase 3
- Timeline, Eligible Applicants and Award Amounts
- Race to the Top Phase 3 Final Requirements
  - Part I
    - Assurance and signatures
  - Part II
    - Plan, activities, performance measure, budget and signatures
- Selected Program Requirements
- Submitting an Application
- Resources and Assistance

11/17/2011

Overview of Race to the Top Phase 3

- The FY 2011 Appropriations Act :
  - provided ~$700 million for the Race to the Top Fund
  - authorized the Secretary to make awards on "the basis of previously submitted applications"
  - amended the ARRA to include grants for improving early childhood care and learning

- Approximately $200 million were made available for Race to the Top Phase 3 to support all or some of the nine unfunded finalists from the Race to the Top Phase 2 competition.

- Race to the Top Phase 3 will reward unfunded finalists for the ambitious reforms and provide funding to enable them to implement meaningful portions of their Phase 2 plans.

Eligible Applicants

States that were finalists, but did not receive grant awards, in the 2010 Race to the Top Phase 2 competition.

Arizona
California
Colorado
Illinois
Kentucky
Louisiana
New Jersey
Pennsylvania
South Carolina

Timeline

September 12, 2011	Notice of Proposed Requirements
November 14, 2011	Notice of Final Requirements, Application and FAQs posted
November 16, 2011	Overview Webinar
November 22, 2011	**Application Part I Due**
*November 23, 2011	*Budget amounts announced
December 16, 2011	**Application Part II Due**
December 20+, 2011	Awards announced

Grant Award Amounts

- States can receive a proportional share of approximately $200 million based on their population of children ages 5 through 17.

- Estimated amounts for which each eligible State could apply are shown in the table below if all States apply:

States	Amount (minimum)
Colorado, Louisiana, South Carolina, Kentucky	$12,250,000
Arizona	$17,500,000
Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Jersey	$28,000,000
California	$49,000,000

- The amounts will increase if one or more States do not apply, do not meet the application requirements, or do not provide the required assurances.

Final Requirements

- In Part I of the application:
  - Application Assurances
  - Signatures of the Governor, the State's chief school officer, and the president of the State board of education, or their authorized representatives

- In Part II of the application:
  - State plan overview and activities selected for funding
  - Performance measures
  - Budget narrative and budget tables
  - Signatures of the Governor, the State's chief school officer, and the president of the State board of education, or their authorized representatives

Part I - Application Assurances

- The State is in compliance with the Education Jobs Fund maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirements in section 101(10)(A) of Public Law 111-226.

- The State is in compliance with the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase 2 requirements with respect to Indicator (b)(1) regarding the State's statewide longitudinal data system. (See notice of final requirements, definitions, and approval criteria for the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program published in the Federal Register on November 12, 2009 (74 FR 58436) and the interim final requirement and request for comments for the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program published in the Federal Register on September 23, 2011 (76 FR 59036)).

Part I – Application Assurances (cont.)

- At the time the State submits its application, there are no legal, statutory, or regulatory barriers at the State level to linking data on student achievement or student growth to teachers and principals for the purpose of teacher and principal evaluation.

- The State will maintain its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by the State's participation in a consortium of States that--
  - Is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments aligned with a common set of K-12 standards that prepare students for college and careers; and
  - Includes a significant number of States.

Part I – Application Assurances (cont.)

- The State will maintain, at a minimum, the conditions for reform described in its Race to the Top Phase 2 application, including--
  - The State's adoption and implementation of a common set of K-12 standards that prepare students for college and careers, as specified in section (B)(1)(ii) of the State's Race to the Top Phase 2 application;
  - The State's statutory and regulatory framework related to improving teacher and school leader effectiveness and ensuring an equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders, as described in section D of the State's Race to the Top Phase 2 application;
  - The State's statutory and regulatory framework for implementing effective school and LEA turnaround measures, as described in section E of the State's Race to the Top Phase 2 application; and
  - The State's statutory and regulatory framework for supporting the creation and expansion of high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools, as described in section (F)(2) of its Race to the Top Phase 2 application.

Part I – Application Assurances (cont.)

- The State will maintain its commitment to comprehensive reforms and innovation designed to increase student achievement and to continued progress in the four reform areas specified in the ARRA, including the adoption and implementation of college and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments, improving the collection and use of data, increasing teacher effectiveness and equity in the distribution of effective teachers, and turning around the State's lowest achieving schools.

- The State will select activities for funding that are consistent with the commitment to comprehensive reform and innovation that the State demonstrated in its Race to the Top Phase 2 application, including activities that are most likely to improve STEM education.

Part I – Application Assurances (cont.)

- The State will comply with all of the accountability, transparency, and reporting requirements that apply to the Race to the Top program (See the notice of final priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria for the Race to the Top Fund published in the Federal Register on November 18, 2009 (74 FR 59688)), with the exception of reporting requirements applicable solely to funds provided under the ARRA. (Note: The ARRA section 1512 reporting requirements do not apply to the funds we will award under the Race to the Top Phase 3 award process).

- The State will comply with the requirements of any evaluation of the program, or of specific activities pursued as part of the program, conducted and supported by the Department.

Part I - Signatures

- Required signatures
  - Signatures of the Governor, the State's chief school officer, and the president of the State board of education, or their authorized representatives

- Not Required
  - Updated Participating or involved LEA signatures (more about this later)
  - Updated Letters of support

Part II- State Plan Overview and Activities Selected for Funding

- State Plan
  - The State must provide an <u>executive summary</u> of its Phase 3 plan, including an explanation of why the State believes the activities selected from Phase 2 Race to the Top submission in its Phase 3 plan will have the greatest impact on advancing its overall statewide reform plan.

- Selected Activities- sub-criterion narrative
  - the State must <u>list the selection sub-criterion</u> from its Phase 2 application the State is proposing to address in Phase 3 (e.g., (D2)), the <u>page reference from the Phase 2 application</u> where the original plan for addressing the sub-criterion can be found, and a <u>narrative description of the Phase 3 plan to address that sub-criterion</u>.

Part II- State plan overview and activities selected for funding (Cont)

- Selected Activities-sub-criterion narrative (continued)
  - The Phase 3 plan should include, at a minimum, the <u>goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties</u> for each proposed activity. States do <u>not</u> resubmit evidence from its Phase 2 application. If it chooses, a Phase 3 applicant may provide updated evidence if it supports the Phase 3 activities. Any new supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included an Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.
  - An <u>explanation of why</u> the State has selected to address the activities in this sub-criterion in its Race to the Top Phase 3 application.

18

Sub-criterion narrative

Selection sub-criterion		Page references from State's Phase 2 application	

[Enter text here]

In addition to addressing this sub-criterion, please explain why your State has selected to address the activities in this sub-criterion in its Race to the Top Phase 3 application.

[Enter text here]

Summary Table for Phase 3 Plan

Elements of State Reform Plans	Performance Measure	Check the appropriate box
A. State Success Factors		
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
B. Standards and Assessments		
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction		
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
D. Great Teachers and Leaders		
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	From Phase 2 application	
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	From Phase 2 application	
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	From Phase 2 application	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools		
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	From Phase 2 application	
F. General Section Criteria		
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charters and other innovative schools	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	
Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)	*Must be proposed by Applicant*	

Check which selection sub-criterion you will be addressing

Part II- Performance Measures

- For each sub-criterion the State submits, it must have a performance measure
  - Where there were required performance measures in Phase 2 application, the State must use those (may adjust targets from its Phase 2 applicaiton).
  - Where performance measures did not exist, the State must propose measures and targets.

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most...)	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014-2015
The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models (described in Appendix C) will be initiated each year.					

Part II- STEM

- States must explain in its detailed plan and budget for Phase 3 funding how it will allocate a meaningful share of its Phase 3 award to advance STEM education in the State.

- States may meet this requirement by including in your plans and budgets:
  - Activities proposed by the State to meet the competitive preference priority for STEM education, if applicable; or
  - Activities within one or more of the four core education reform areas that are most likely to improve STEM education.

Part II- STEM

- **B-6. What do we mean by allocating a meaningful share of a State's Phase 3 funds to advance STEM education in the State?**

  In general, the allocation of a "meaningful share" of a State's Phase 3 award for STEM education means sufficient funding for selected activities that are likely to result in measurable improvement in one or more STEM outcomes related to each activity. For example, a $2 million investment in expanding the number of teachers qualified to teach Advanced Placement (AP) Calculus would be considered meaningful if the State could demonstrate that this level of funding would lead to a significant percent increase in the number of students in high-poverty schools taking AP Calculus over a 3-year period

PART II- Participating LEAs

- **D-6. Must a State that is applying in Phase 3 obtain new Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) from their participating LEAs?**

  A State applying for Race to the Top Phase 3 funds need <u>not</u> revise Phase 2 MOUs or include the MOUs in its application. Rather, States will work with LEAs during the application process and the beginning of the grant period to update and finalize local scopes of work. (See also D-9). At that time, the State must ensure that it has an MOU or other binding agreement for any new participating LEA (i.e., one that was not a participating LEA in Phase 2) demonstrating the LEA's commitment to the State's plan.

Budget

- **Same format as Phase 2 application, but in Excel.**

- **Budget Summary**
  - Table: Total proposed budget, by category.
  - Narrative: Overview of how the budget has been organized into projects.

- **Project-Level Budgets**
  - Table: Budget for each project, by category.
  - Narrative: Backup detail for each category in each project budget.

Budget Summary Narrative

- Describe the overall structure of, and rationale for, the State's proposed Race to the Top Phase 3 budget, including:
  - The list of projects that have project-level budgets.
  - Specific elements that you want to draw attention to.
  - Anything that is not covered elsewhere in the project-level budget descriptions.
  - How it plans to direct a meaningful share of its Phase 3 award to advance STEM education in the State.

- Provide sufficient detail:
  - Ensure consistency between budget narratives and figures in budget tables.
  - Plan for leveraging other funds.
  - Explain how other Federal, State, and local funds will be leveraged to further support Race to the Top education reform plans.

Project-Level Budget Narrative

- Provide a budget narrative that accompanies the Project-Level Budget Table and backup detail associated with each budget category in the Project-Level Budget.

  - Detail is important.

  - The number of projects will vary from State to State. That's fine –just make sure your projects tie directly to your plans.

  - Err on the side of providing too much detail rather than not enough.

A Note on Budgets for Participating LEAs

- Regarding the 50% of the funds that go to participating LEAs: States are not required to provide budgets describing how participating LEAs will use their section 14006(c) funds (see line 14 of the Budget Summary Table).

- However, the Department expects States to monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that participating LEAs spend these funds in accordance with the State's plan and the scope of work described in the agreement between the State and the participating LEA.

- If the State is awarded a Race to the Top grant, its participating LEAs will have up to 100 days to complete final scopes of work, workplans, and budgets. At the conclusion of that period, States will notify LEAs of their final section 14006(c) subgrants.

Part II - Signatures

- Required signatures
  - Signatures of the Governor, the State's chief school officer, and the president of the State board of education, or their authorized representatives

- Not Required
  - Updated Participating or involved LEA signatures (more about this later)
  - Updated Letters of support

Selected Program Requirements

- The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) will conduct a series of national evaluations of Race to the Top's State grantees as part of its evaluation of programs. The Department's goal for these evaluations is to ensure that its studies not only assess program impacts, but also provide valuable information to State and local educators to help inform and improve their practices.

- The agreements signed by participating LEAs must include a scope-of-work section. The scope of work submitted by LEAs and States as part of their Race to the Top applications will be preliminary. Preliminary scopes of work should include the portions of the State's proposed reform plans that the LEA is agreeing to implement. If a State is awarded a Race to the Top grant, its participating LEAs will have up to 100 days to complete final scopes of work, which must contain detailed work plans that are consistent with their preliminary scopes of work and with the State's grant application, and should include the participating LEAs' specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures.

Selected Program Requirements

- Unless otherwise protected by law or agreement as proprietary information, the State and its subgrantees must make any work (*e.g.*, materials, tools, processes, systems) developed under its grant freely available to others, including but not limited to by posting the work on a website identified or sponsored by the Department.

- The State must participate in applicable technical assistance activities that may be conducted by the Department or its designees.

- No funds awarded under this competition may be used to pay for costs related to statewide summative assessments.

Application Submission Procedures

- Part I of the application must be submitted on paper with original signatures from the Governor, the State's chief school officer, and the president of the State board of education.

- Part II of the Phase 3 application must—

  - be submitted in electronic format on a CD or DVD that includes a PDF copy of the completed application, a PDF document containing all of the required signature pages; and

  - include copies of the completed <u>Excel budget spreadsheets</u>.

- Indicate CFDA number 84.395A on both submissions (Part I and Part II)

Application Submission Procedures (cont.)

- Part I
  - Applications must be **received** (not postmarked!) by 4:30p.m. (Washington DC time) on **November 22, 2011.**

- Part II
  - Applications must be **received** (not postmarked!) by 4:30p.m. (Washington DC time) on **December 16, 2011.**

Application Review Process

- Department staff will review the Race to the Top Phase 3 Part I and Part II applications.
  - Peer review by outside experts is not necessary because Phase 3 is not a competition and States will be submitting applications that are consistent with the content of their Phase 2 applications (which have already been peer-reviewed).

- Due to time constraints, while grants must be awarded by December 31, 2011, budget reviews may go into January 2012.

Contact Us

- Website:
  http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase3-resources.html

- Email:
  Racetothetop@ed.gov or Meredith.farace@ed.gov

- Telephone:
  202-401-8368 (Meredith Farace's direct line)